

OFFICIAL

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
PATENT EXAMINING OPERATIONRECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 30 2004

Applicant(s): Glen H. ERIKSON et al.

Serial No: 09/885,731

Group Art Unit: 1637

Filed: June 20, 2001

Examiner: S. Chunduru

Att. Docket No.: E1047/20056

Confirmation No.: 6800

For: NUCLEIC ACID MULTIPLEX FORMATION

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATIONMail Stop Non-Fee Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated December 2, 2003, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-5 and 7-55 are pending, with claims 28 and 30-55 being withdrawn from consideration pursuant to a restriction requirement.

Claims 1-5, 7-27 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,451,502 (hereinafter "George") in view of McGavin et al., J. Mol. Graphics, Vol. 7, pp. 218-232, 1989 (hereinafter "McGavin"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

George teaches a method for creating double-stranded nucleic acid multiplex structures. McGavin is cited to remedy George's acknowledged failure to "specifically [teach] that the multiplex structure (probe-target complex) is [bonded] solely through Watson-Crick base triplets." See Office Action at page 4, last paragraph. McGavin discloses theoretical, computer-based models for multiplex nucleic acid sequences based on Watson-Crick bonding, but does not disclose or suggest

Application No. 09/885,731  
Request for Reconsideration Dated January 30, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of December 2, 2003

how the virtual structures described by the computer models could be prepared using real nucleic acids. Thus, McGavin is non-enabling prior art, which the Office Action applies based on an improper "obvious-to-try" standard of obviousness. In *Gillette Co. v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc.*, 919 F.2d 720, 726, 16 USPQ2d 1923, 1929 (Fed. Cir. 1990), the court held:

[A]n "obvious-to-try" situation exists when a general disclosure may pique the scientist's curiosity, such that further investigation might be done as a result of the disclosure, but the disclosure itself does not contain a sufficient teaching of how to obtain the desired result, or that the claimed result would be obtained if certain directions were pursued. *In re Eli Lilly & Co.*, 902 F.2d 943, 945, 14 USPQ2d 1741, 1743 (Fed. Cir. 1990). However, we have consistently held that "obvious to try" is not to be equated with obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103.

One skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have lacked motivation to employ the purely theoretical teachings of McGavin to modify the primary reference, George, and reach the claimed invention with a reasonable expectation of success. McGavin's virtual teachings provide no guidance regarding how George could be modified to reach the reality of the claimed invention. McGavin simply "does not contain a sufficient teaching of how to obtain the desired result." *Gillette Co., supra*, 919 F.2d at 726.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection over George in view of McGavin are respectfully requested.

For at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Application No. 09/885,731  
Request for Reconsideration Dated January 30, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of December 2, 2003

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CAESAR, RIVISE, BERNSTEIN,  
COHEN & POKOTILOW, LTD.

January 30, 2004

Please charge or credit our Account  
No. 03-0075 as necessary to effect  
entry and/or ensure consideration of  
this submission.

By 

David M. Tener  
Registration No. 37,054  
Customer No. 03000  
(215) 567-2010  
Attorneys for Applicants